Comparative Heliophysics Program
Summer 2016 at NASA Ames Research Center

3D GLOBAL MODELING OF THE SOLAR DYNAMO

ANDREY M. STEJKO[1], GUSTAVO G. GUERRERO[2] AND ALEXANDER G. KOSOVICHEV[3]

[1]New Jersey Institute of Technology
323 Dr Martin Luther King Jr Blvd
Newark, NJ 07012, USA
e-mail: ams226@njit.edu

[2]Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais
Av. Antonio Carlos, 6627
Belo Horizonte, MG, 31270-901, Brazil
e-mail: guerrero@fisica.ufmg.br

[3]New Jersey Institute of Technology
323 Dr Martin Luther King Jr Blvd
Newark, NJ 07012, USA
e-mail: sasha@bbso.njit.edu

arXiv:1701.08450v1 [astro-ph.SR] 29 Jan 2017

Key words: Solar Physics, Computational Fluid Dynamics, Solar Modeling

Abstract. We are attempting to use 3D global MHD models to accurately reproduce the magnetic dynamo and other patterns of solar activity. Our work is focused on modeling the entire solar convection zone so that we can try to reproduce the interconnected effects that generate the solar cycle. Using data from standard reference models, such as the model S [4], we map the ambient state for a polytropic ideal gas and solve for its advection to model the propagation of turbulent convective transport and magnetic induction throughout the region. We use new approaches to these models to better understand the impact that different parameters can have on an evolving system. We model 3 different resolutions with the following grid points: (512 ϕ, 256 θ, 256 R), (256 ϕ, 128 θ, 128 R) and (128 ϕ, 64 θ, 64 R), as well as varying models of convection. The 2 higher resolution models express an implicit viscosity that is just too unrealistic to take away any significant results, however the changes in convection profiles in the low resolution models show how minor changes in convection can change the axisymmetric pattern of the dynamo cycle.

1 INTRODUCTION

In the field of astrophysics, MHD (magnetohydrodynamic) models have been making big impacts in recent years. In fact, some of the most profound discoveries about the nature of solar activity have come from computational models rather than direct observation. The scope of information that we can learn by looking at the solar surface is limited, and while helioseismology has been making great strides in helping us understand the activity in these inner layers, there is still a lot that we do not understand.

The motivation behind creating simulations of the sun lies in this limit, as it lets us observe how plasma reacts in certain situations and can give us a glimpse into the inner physical workings of these systems. MHD modeling is, however, still in its infancy and relies greatly on trying new and different techniques to try to reproduce accurate solar activity. Full direct numerical simulation of plasma is still too costly and too inefficient to create models of serious scale and duration so we must rely on approximations that give us similar effects. These approximations can introduce error and uncertainty into our models, but they can also reproduce many of the effects that drive the sun and give us a deep insight into their nature. As we try different techniques in modeling, new and interesting effects will emerge.

In this project we are trying to create global models that act enough like a star that the major features that we observe correlate to a realistic pattern of solar behavior. We are using models with varying parameters so that we can better understand the initial settings that will generate the desired effects. Our goal is to understand how slight differences in the sun can evolve into variations of sustained patterns, which will help shed light on the sun's pattern of activity and enable us to create more realistic models.

To achieve this breadth of work, we use computationally inexpensive techniques for advection modeling, specifically the MPDATA scheme in EULAG, which uses is a finite-difference grid solver that uses the same advection algorithm to solve for all dependent variables [5]. The error generated in the solution of fluid motion between cells is used as an approximation for viscous dissipation of momentum [6]. This is a very efficient fluid solver that lets us simulate long scales of evolution in our models in a relatively short amount of time, but its nature lets a certain level of unpredictability into our work. Since the error in finite-difference solutions depends on the size of the cells and the time-step between solutions, we find that our models do not necessarily converge at all resolutions. This is a pertinent problem, but the efficiency of the algorithm merits a look into the effects that different sizes of models generate. One aspect of our work is trying to understand the differences that varying implicit viscosities can create, and to figure out the best possible model for viscous dissipation in different regions of the sun.

We are also looking at some of the physical effects that can produce variations in the solar cycle. We approximate energy transport in the sun by forcing convection in our models in an approach similar to the Boussinesq approximation in the solution to the Navier-Stokes equations. This gives us the freedom to create and alter zones of convec-

tion and reproduce the fluid shear zones that can play a large role on the sun. These shear zones such as the tachocline and near-surface shear layer can have a monumental effect on the formation and long term storage of magnetic fields which can be a major contributing factor in the duration of the dynamo cycle [1,2]. In our work we show that slight alterations to these zones can drastically change the timescale and pattern of the solar cycle, affecting the strength of the magnetic field and even changing the axisymmetric pattern of magnetic activity.

We hope that this work can shed some light on processes in the solar interior, and can help us develop better models of the sun. We also want to work with the visualization team at NASA to create 3D videos of the higher resolution data that can be used as a resource by the community to get a better look at the dynamics of the solar interior as well as for generating interest in solar modeling among students and members of the public who are interested in the subject.

2 MODEL DESCRIPTION

The model used in this work is a fully global 3D MHD simulation of plasma flows. It is run with a specialized form of the EULAG code - based on an upwind MPDATA scheme, developed by Piotr Smolarkiewicz, to simulate anelastic incompressible flows by solving the Navier-Stokes equations with an additional induction term for the magnetic field generated by the motion of the plasma. This is a continuation of the work done by Guerrero et al.[1,2,3] The equations used in these models are formulated in the anelastic approximation as follows:

$$\nabla \cdot (\rho_s u) = 0 \tag{1}$$

$$\frac{Du}{Dt} + 2\Omega \times u = -\nabla(\frac{\rho'}{\rho_s}) + g(\frac{\Theta'}{\Theta_s}) + \frac{1}{\mu_0 \rho_s}(B \cdot \nabla)B \tag{2}$$

$$\frac{D\Theta'}{Dt} = -u \cdot \nabla\Theta_e - \frac{\Theta'}{\tau} \tag{3}$$

$$\frac{DB}{Dt} = (B \cdot \nabla)u - B(\nabla \cdot u) \tag{4}$$

These equations are the solutions for velocity and magnetic fields in an anelastic fluid in a rotating reference frame. We can ignore the viscous term entirely since our viscosity is computed implicitly following an ILES formulation. This formulation lets us model turbulence by introducing implicit viscosity from a residual error in the solution to these equations between grid spaces. This residual error can be computed in a solution that is similar in form to the large-eddy simulation approach in sub-grid scale simulations of turbulence [6], which gives us a rationale for using this method to simulate turbulent dissipation, even though it can be somewhat unpredictable. In these equations we solve for the fluid pressure (p') and potential temperature perturbations (Θ') from a stable background state described by an isentropic ideal gas model in hydrostatic equilibrium

(Θ_s = constant). The thermodynamic relation is solved for perturbations from an ambient state in a partially unstable equilibrium (Θ_e), solved for a standard polytropic ideal gas model under gravity, described by the hydrostatic relation in equation 5:

$$\frac{dT}{dt} = \frac{g}{(1+m)R} \tag{5}$$

This equation is solved along the radius of the sun (R), creating a spherically symmetric convective profile. We choose a polytropic index (m) that will help us to create the correct zones of stable and unstable equilibrium. For most of our models we use (m = 2) for the radiative zone and (m = 1.4995) for the convective zone resulting in a radial solution as shown in figure 1:



Figure 1: The potential temperature (Θ) in Kelvin, against percent radius of the sun. This figure shows how we choose a polytropic index in the solution to the hydrostatic equilibrium to create a sub-adiabatic zone (m = 2) and a super-adiabatic zone (m = 1.4995).

In an ideal gas, a polytropic index above 1.5 will create a gas whose density will decrease faster along height than the force of gravity. This puts the gas in a state of stable hydrostatic equilibrium where perturbations in gas density return to their original positions faster with a higher the polytropic index. Right below (m = 1.5) the density does not decrease fast enough as we move upwards along the radius so small perturbations in the position of these parcels of gas will continue to increase. This unstable equilibrium

creates natural downdrafts and updrafts that can simulate convection relatively well. To make sure that the gas does not simply resettle over time, we introduce a dampening term (Θ'/τ) which governs the relaxation of perturbations. As convection develops, the perturbations begin to relax back into a stable isentropic state (Θ_s) over some period of time, letting new perturbations form and continue simulating convection. The time period of these relaxations (τ) is chosen to be about 5 years, a value that we have found helps create convection analogous to that of the sun. This model can simulate convection faithfully and gives us the advantage of being able to choose our models of convection rather than relying on solutions of energy transfer, which could make the computations more expensive as well as introduce their own inaccuracies.

The models themselves are computed on a 3-dimensional grid in the ϕ (Azimuth), θ (Latitude), and R (Radius), which cover the entire sphere of the sun from a radius of about 0.61 R_{sun} to 0.96 R_{sun}. The different grid resolutions we use range from (128 ϕ, 64 θ, 64 R) to (512 ϕ, 256 θ, 256 R). The data is also computed with variations in the polytropic index, which lets us control convective strength, and create naturally forming shear zones at the tachocline and at the surface.

3 RESULTS

3.1 High resolution (H1, H2)

We have computed models for 3 varying resolutions with the following grid points: (128 ϕ, 64 θ, 64 R), (256 ϕ, 128 θ, 128 R) and (512 ϕ, 256 θ, 256 R). To try and better understand the effects of a changing resolution, we used the same background profile for the two higher resolution models (H1 and H2) as the solar rotation rate model (RC02) described in detail by Guerrero et al. [2] The differential rotation and meridional circulation profiles for H1 and H2 can be found in figure 2.

It can be clearly seen that as resolution is increased, viscosity seems to decrease. This is not at all surprising since our implicit viscosity depends on the error in a finite-difference solution, which will be less pronounced when solving for a decreased grid size. Such a dramatic change in viscosity has great repercussions for the model - the differential rotation can no longer evenly mix, which lets the Coriolis force take over and create a sizable shear layer that slices through the star. This layer plays havoc with the magnetic field, preventing it from moving from the tachocline to the surface, going as far as completely eliminating solar cycles. The meridional circulation also loses its non-axisymmetric pattern as a result. The turbulent dissipation is greatly affected, giving us weaker magnetic fields that take much longer to evolve.



Figure 2: The differential rotation and meridional circulation profiles for H1 (256 ϕ, 128 θ, 128 R) and H2 (512 ϕ, 256 θ, 256 R). The differential rotation changes drastically from what we would expect to see on the sun due to a severley decreased implicit viscosity. The meridional circulation is also greatly altered as a result.

3.2 Low resolution (ns1, ns2, ns3)

For the low resolution models (128 ϕ, 64 θ, 64 R), we wanted to see how changing convection at the surface can affect the evolution of a magnetic field. Unlike H1 and H2, these models exhibit a much more accurate representation of plasma flow on the sun. The viscosity creates a much more solar-like distribution in differential rotation and meridional circulation which can create semi-accurate accurate solar cycles [3]. Even though the evolutionary time period of the magnetic field can achieve a much longer solar cycle than many models without a tachocline [1], there are still problems in the model - specifically in the non-axisymmetric nature of the field. For the evolution of a realistic dynamo, two very important factors are the 2 large shear layers on the sun: the

tachocline and the near-surface shear layer. These two layers can store the magnetic field for a period of time and help it evolve between a poloidal and toroidal field. Our goal was to investigate how different convection profiles at the surface can affect the nature of this transition. In figure 3 we can see the 3 different ambient potential temperature profiles we used for the models (ns1, ns2, ns3).



Figure 3: The potential temperature (Θ) profiles for ns1, ns2, and ns3 (128 ϕ, 64 θ, 64 R). ns1) The super-adiabatic zone is slightly altered at the surface to decrease the rate of convection. ns2) The convection is greatly suppressed at the surface. ns3) The convection is slightly increased at the surface in a more realistic solar-like fashion.

In ns1 the convection was slightly suppressed at the surface, in ns2 the convection was greatly suppressed, and in ns3 the rate of convection was slightly increased to create a shear layer similar to the one at the surface of sun. We were interested in the different effects that these models can generate with varying profiles. The first two cases are extreme versions so that we can get a better understanding of the variations that these profiles can produce. Some of these changes can be seen in differential rotation and in meridional circulation as shown below:



Figure 4: The differential rotation and meridional circulation profiles for ns1, ns2, and ns3 (128 ϕ, 64 θ, 64 R). They remain relatively unchanged for the profiles, the most prominent difference being between the rotation rate of the radiative core.

The largest differences are in the differential rotation profiles, as the meridional profiles seem to mostly be conserved in a 2 cell structure. The most interesting differences in the

rotational profiles are in the rate of rotation below the tachocline. Increased convection at the surface seems to generate a faster rotation of the radiative zone. As we approach solar-like convection parameters, the radiation zone speeds up close to the rate of rotation at the equator, similar to what we observe on the sun. This may result from increased turbulent diffusion of velocity that is created by parcels of plasma hitting the tachocline boundary with greater speeds. The most interesting differences in these models however, are in the magnetic fields. These different profiles create stable magnetic dynamos that change from being axisymmetric to being non-axisymmetric. These results can be found in figure 5:



Figure 5: The time-latitude diagrams for the magnetic field (B_ϕ) of ns1, ns2, and ns3 (128 ϕ, 64 θ, 64 R) at 0.70 R_{sun} on the left and 0.95 R_{sun} on the right. ns1) The field follows a distinct pattern, but the non-axisymmetric nature we observe on the sun is lost. ns2) The convection profile is altered so greatly that the field itself is unstable and non-uniform but with definitive pattern. ns3) With a more solar-like convection the beginnings of a non-axisymmetric magnetic cycle seem to be forming.

As we can see, the solar cycle in ns1 is completely symmetric. As we suppress convection further, the magnetic field starts to deform, but the general structure is still axisymmetric. However, when we increase surface convection, the structure of the field changes drastically. The length of activity still does not match the period of the solar cycle, but the pattern approaches what we observe on the sun. In this model, almost the entire poloidal field is generated by the turbulent alpha effect in the first-order smoothing approximation in mean field dynamo theory [3,7], so one of the problems with symmetry may just be a result of not having enough of the magnetic field at the surface to generate a poloidal field when convection is suppressed. Another potential reason for this anti-axisymmetric field is due to different conditions in the tachocline. As we can see in figure 6, the overall Urms profiles of ns1 and ns3 are pretty similar until we reach the tachocline. In ns3 the rate of turbulent dissipation remains much more steady in the area, whereas in ns1 it simply falls off. This implies that there may be more consistent turbulent action in this layer, and since the magnetic field is almost entirely generated and evolved in the tachocline in these models [3] it can have a significant effect on the structure of this field.



Figure 6: The U_{rms} profiles for ns1, ns2, and ns3 (128 ϕ, 64 θ, 64 R) against percent of solar radius (R_{sun}). The profile in ns2 is almost unrecognizable, but the prfiles for ns1 and ns3 are very similar with exception of the more stable region of turbulent activity in and below the tachocline in ns3.

4 CONCLUSION

There is still a lot of work to be done on these models before coming to any definitive conclusions, however, it can still be beneficial to see how radically these models can change under varying parameters. We can predict many effects that will emerge when we use CFD (computational fluid dynamics) to simulate our theories, but it is equally as interesting to see effects that we do not expect. Exercises such as this one are an important step to getting a more fundamental understanding of the physics that supports these models.

Increasing the resolution of these models was interesting, but not very fruitful. It seems that the difference in implicit viscosity is too great, and any meaningful results that we can interpret will be significantly diluted by error. Another large issue is that running these high resolution models puts a strain on resources, as they take an exceedingly long time to compute - 5 to 10 times longer than the lower resolution models. In effect, there is not much point in simulating these different resolutions unless we change the scheme itself. A useful addition to these models would be computing the implicit viscosity between each grid cell during a single time step, averaging those values over the space of the model, and introducing an explicit viscosity value in the next time step to bring our turbulent dissipation to a level we need. This is a relatively low cost approach, but it may still be unnecessary. Depending on how much the Urms fluctuates over the course of a solar cycle we may simply just add an overarching explicit viscosity term that could give us what we are looking for.

The low resolution models, however, gave us some very interesting results as the increased convection at the surface resulted in a change in the axisymmetric pattern of the magnetic field. We are still not sure what exactly causes the field to change this way, or whether the primary drivers of this change are at the surface or at the tachocline. We are currently running further models of this effect by trying out different patterns of convection and observing how the magnetic field evolves in different regions of the sun, but there is still a lot of work to be done with these models.

The main problem with CFD models lies in how changing some minor parameters can extract large differences in effects, and explorations of these differences is an important step in improving our models and moving forward with our understanding of the physics the drive them.

5 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the NASA Ames Research Center and Dr. Nagi Mansour for organizing this amazing summer program. This kind of access to resources and professionals in the field is an invaluable opportunity for students. I would also like to thank Francisco Camacho and Bonnie Zaire for helping me understand some of the intricacies of these models and helping me to learn python.

REFERENCES

[1] Guerrero, G., Smolarkiewicz, P.K., Kosovichev, A.G., Mansour N.N., *Differential rotation in solar-like stars from global simulations*. The Astrophysical Journal 779 (2), p. 176, (2013)

[2] Kosovichev, A.G., Guerrero, G., Smolarkiewicz, P.K., Mansour N.N., *Effects of Tachocline in Solar-Stellar Dynamo Simulations*. IAU General Assembly 22, 58507, (2015)

[3] Guerrero, G., Smolarkiewicz, P.K., Gouveia Dal Pino, E.M., Kosovichev, A.G., Mansour N.N., *On the role of tachoclines in solar and stellar dynamos*. The Astrophysical Journal 819 (2), (2016)

[4] Christensen-Dalsgaard, J., Dppen, W., Ajukov, S. V., Anderson, E. R., Antia, H. M., Basu, S., Baturin, V. A., Berthomieu, G., Chaboyer, B., Chitre, S. M., Cox, A. N., Demarque, P., Donatowicz, J., Dziembowski, W. A., Gabriel, M., Gough, D. O., Guenther, D. B., Guzik, J. A., Harvey, J. W., Hill, F., Houdek, G., Iglesias, C. A., Kosovichev, A. G., Leibacher, J. W., Morel, P., Proffitt, C. R., Provost, J., Reiter, J., Rhodes Jr., E. J., Rogers, F. J., Roxburgh, I. W., Thompson, M. J., Ulrich, R. K., *The Current State of Solar Modeling*, Science, New Series, Vol. 272, No. 5266, pp. 1286-1292, (1996)

[5] Smolarkiewicz, P.K., Margolin, L.G., *MPDATA: A Finite-Difference Solver for Geophysical Flows*. Journal of Computaional Physics 140, pp. 459480, (1998)

[6] Margolin, L.G., Rider W.J, *A rationale for implicit turbulence modelling*. International Journal for Numerical Methods in Fluids, 39, pp. 82184, (2002)

[7] Brandenburg, A., Subramanian, K., *Astrophysical magnetic fields and nonlinear dynamo theory*. Physics Reports, 417, Issue 1-4, pp. 1-209. (2005)